

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/597,681	HOSOYA, MAKOTO	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	CHESTER T. BARRY	1797	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) CHESTER T. BARRY (3) _____

(2) Arnold Turk (4) _____

Date of Interview: 20 August 2009

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: 10.

Identification of prior art discussed: None.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Mr Turk requested consideration of the IDS filed 7/21/09. In response to the Examiner's comment with respect to claim 10, Mr Turk requested that claim 10 be amended as set forth in the Examiner's Amendment. The Examiner notes that at least Example 1 and paragraph [0015] together provide adequate written description of the now-recited concentration.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.